

A Limit on the Speed of Quantum Computation for Insertion into an Ordered List*

Edward Farhi[†] and Jeffrey Goldstone[‡]

*Center for Theoretical Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139*

Sam Gutmann[§]

*Department of Mathematics
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115*

Michael Sipser^{**}

*Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139*

MIT-CTP-2811 quant-ph/9812057

December 1998

Abstract

We consider the problem of inserting a new item into an ordered list of $N-1$ items. The length of an algorithm is measured by the number of comparisons it makes between the new item and items already on the list. Classically, determining the insertion point requires $\log N$ comparisons. We show that, for N large, no quantum algorithm can reduce the number of comparisons below $\log N / (2 \log \log N)$.

*This work was supported in part by The Department of Energy under cooperative agreement DE-FC02-94ER40818 and by the National Science Foundation under grant NSF 95-03322 CCR.

[†]farhi@mit.edu

[‡]goldstone@mitlms.mit.edu

[§]sgutm@nuhub.neu.edu

^{**}sipser@math.mit.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum mechanical algorithms can outperform classical algorithms in certain cases. Classically searching an unordered list of N items takes of order N queries. Quantum mechanically this can be accomplished with of order $\sqrt{N}$ queries [1]. There is also a lower bound of $\sqrt{N}$ for this quantum problem [2] so the square root speedup is optimal. However square root speedup is not universal. For example, determining the parity of a list of N items, each equal to plus one or minus one, requires N queries classically and at least $N/2$ queries quantum mechanically [3], [4].

In this paper, we consider the problem of inserting a new item into an ordered list of $N - 1$ items. A single (classical) query consists of comparing the new item with any chosen item on the list to see if the new item comes before or after the chosen item. Classically, the best algorithm for determining the point of insertion is binary search, which uses $\log_2 N$ queries. We show that quantum mechanically, for large N , an algorithm which succeeds after k quantum queries must have

$$k > \frac{\log_2 N}{2 \log_2 \log_2 N} . \quad (1)$$

The same bound is obtained if we only ask the algorithm to determine the point of insertion correctly with probability $\epsilon > 0$ (where ϵ does not depend on N). A lower bound of order $\sqrt{\log N} / \log \log N$ recently appeared in [5].

Our result shows that possible quantum improvement in this problem is at most modest. In a sequel to this paper we will demonstrate a quantum algorithm that succeeds in $c \log_2 N$ quantum queries with $c < 1$.

II. PRELIMINARIES

The classical problem of inserting one item into an ordered list of $N - 1$ items is equivalent to the following oracular problem. Consider the N functions F_j defined on the set $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ by

$$F_j(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x < j \\ 0 & x \geq j \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$. A query consists of giving the oracle a value of x with the oracle returning $F_j(x)$ for some fixed but unknown j . The problem is to determine j . Binary search determines j with $\log_2 N$ queries, which is the optimal result classically.

(The reader may have noticed that $F_j(N) = 1$ for all j so querying the oracle with $x = N$ is of no help. However for later convenience we want the size of the domain of F_j to equal the number of functions.)

Quantum mechanically we work in a Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis

$$\{|x, q, w\rangle\} \text{ with } \begin{cases} x = 1, 2, \dots, N \\ q = 0, 1 \\ w = 1, 2, \dots, W \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

1

where q and w label a basis for the work-space of dimension $2W$. Given an oracle associated with any function $F(x)$ which can take the values 0 and 1, a quantum query is an application of the unitary operator, $\hat{F}$, defined by

$$\hat{F}|x, q, w\rangle = |x, F(x) \oplus q, w\rangle . \quad (4)$$

A quantum algorithm which makes k queries starts with a state $|s\rangle$ (which is a superposition of the states in (3)) and alternately applies $\hat{F}$ and F -independent unitary operators, V_i , producing

$$|\psi_F\rangle = V_k \hat{F} V_{k-1} \cdots \hat{F} V_1 \hat{F} |s\rangle . \quad (5)$$

The V 's may act in the full Hilbert space. Designing an algorithm consists of choosing $|s\rangle$ and the V 's. For the insert problem where $F(x)$ is guaranteed to be one of the N functions $F_j(x)$ of the form (2), a k -query algorithm succeeds if $|\psi_{F_\ell}\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\psi_{F_m}\rangle$ for $\ell \neq m$. A single measurement will then distinguish the N different F_j .

III. MAIN RESULT

We now show that, for N large, a k -query algorithm cannot distinguish the N different F_j if k is less than $\frac{\log_2 N}{2 \log_2 \log_2 N}$. Consider a particular k -query algorithm of the form (5), that is, a sequence of queries alternating with other unitary transformations, acting on a fixed initial state. A successful algorithm achieves an adequate separation of the final states associated with the different values of j . However the separation obtained with a single query is limited. We show that after the first query there is a range of consecutive j 's for which the algorithm has achieved little separation. Similarly after the second query there is a subrange of consecutive j 's for which the algorithm has achieved only slightly more separation. We can continue subdividing the range of j 's with each subsequent query as long as at least two values of j remain in the range. If, in fact, after k queries, two values of j remain and the separation between the two corresponding states is still small, then the algorithm has failed.

To carry this out we first we define projectors

$$P(a, b) = \sum_{a < x \leq b} \sum_q \sum_w |x, q, w\rangle \langle x, q, w| \quad (6a)$$

with $0 \leq a < b \leq N$. Note that these operators act as the identity on the work-space. The orthogonal projectors are given by

$$P^\perp(a, b) = \left(\sum_{x \leq a} + \sum_{x > b} \right) \sum_q \sum_w |x, q, w\rangle \langle x, q, w| \quad (6b)$$

and clearly $P(a, b) + P^\perp(a, b)$ is the identity operator.

The algorithm starts in the state $|s\rangle$. We write $|s\rangle$ as a sum of L orthogonal pieces

$$|s\rangle = \sum_{r=0}^{L-1} P\left(r \frac{N}{L}, (r+1) \frac{N}{L}\right) |s\rangle \quad (7)$$

where L is to be determined later but is small compared to N . (For clarity, we pretend that certain numbers such as $\frac{N}{L}$ are always integers.) There is an r , call it r_1 , such that

$$\left\| P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L}, (r_1 + 1) \frac{N}{L}\right) |s\rangle \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \quad . \quad (8)$$

We now write

$$|s\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle + |\phi_1^\perp\rangle \quad (9a)$$

where

$$|\phi_1\rangle = P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L}, (r_1 + 1) \frac{N}{L}\right) |s\rangle \quad (9b)$$

and

$$|\phi_1^\perp\rangle = P^\perp\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L}, (r_1 + 1) \frac{N}{L}\right) |s\rangle \quad . \quad (9c)$$

We assume that the oracle holds the function $F_j(x)$. After one quantum query and the application of the first F -independent unitary operator we arrive at

$$V_1 \hat{F}_j |s\rangle = V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1\rangle + V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1^\perp\rangle \quad . \quad (10)$$

Observe that $V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1^\perp\rangle$ does not vary with j for $r_1 \frac{N}{L} < j \leq (r_1 + 1) \frac{N}{L}$ and for these j we write

$$V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1^\perp\rangle = |\gamma_1\rangle \quad . \quad (11)$$

We now write $P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L}, (r_1 + 1) \frac{N}{L}\right) |\gamma_1\rangle$, whose norm is at most 1, as the sum of L orthogonal pieces

$$P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L}, (r_1 + 1) \frac{N}{L}\right) |\gamma_1\rangle = \sum_{r=0}^{L-1} P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L} + r \frac{N}{L^2}, r_1 \frac{N}{L} + (r + 1) \frac{N}{L^2}\right) |\gamma_1\rangle \quad (12)$$

and choose a value of r , call it r_2 , such that

$$\left\| P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L} + r_2 \frac{N}{L^2}, r_1 \frac{N}{L} + (r_2 + 1) \frac{N}{L^2}\right) |\gamma_1\rangle \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \quad . \quad (13)$$

We write $|\gamma_1\rangle = |\phi_2\rangle + |\phi_2^\perp\rangle$ with

$$|\phi_2\rangle = P\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L} + r_2 \frac{N}{L^2}, r_1 \frac{N}{L} + (r_2 + 1) \frac{N}{L^2}\right) |\gamma_1\rangle \quad (14a)$$

and

$$|\phi_2^\perp\rangle = P^\perp\left(r_1 \frac{N}{L} + r_2 \frac{N}{L^2}, r_1 \frac{N}{L} + (r_2 + 1) \frac{N}{L^2}\right) |\gamma_1\rangle \quad . \quad (14b)$$

We now have

$$V_1 \hat{F}_j |s\rangle = V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1\rangle + |\phi_2\rangle + |\phi_2^\perp\rangle \quad . \quad (15)$$

Application of $\hat{F}_j$ and V_2 yields

$$V_2 \hat{F}_j V_1 \hat{F}_j |s\rangle = V_2 \hat{F}_j V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1\rangle + V_2 \hat{F}_j |\phi_2\rangle + V_2 \hat{F}_j |\phi_2^\perp\rangle \quad . \quad (16)$$

The state $V_2 \hat{F}_j |\phi_2^\perp\rangle$ does not vary with j for the $\frac{N}{L^2}$ values of j in the range $r_1 \frac{N}{L} + r_2 \frac{N}{L^2} < j \leq r_1 \frac{N}{L} + (r_2 + 1) \frac{N}{L^2}$. Recall that $\left\| |\phi_1\rangle \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$ and $\left\| |\phi_2\rangle \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$ so by unitarity

$$\left\| V_2 \hat{F}_j V_1 \hat{F}_j |\phi_1\rangle \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$$

and

$$\|V_2\hat{F}_j|\phi_2\rangle\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \quad . \quad (17)$$

Repeating this procedure for a total of k queries and correspondingly k subdivisions, we get

$$V_k\hat{F}_j \cdots V_1\hat{F}_j|s\rangle = |\delta_1\rangle + |\delta_2\rangle + \dots |\delta_k\rangle + V_k\hat{F}_j|\phi_k^\perp\rangle \quad (18)$$

where $\| |\delta_i\rangle \| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $V_k\hat{F}_j|\phi_k^\perp\rangle$ does not vary with j in a range of size $\frac{N}{L^k}$. Eq. (18) can also be written as

$$V_k\hat{F}_j \cdots V_1\hat{F}_j|s\rangle = |\delta\rangle + V_k\hat{F}_j|\phi_k^\perp\rangle \quad (19)$$

where

$$|\delta\rangle = \sum_i |\delta_i\rangle$$

and

$$\| |\delta\rangle \| \leq \frac{k}{\sqrt{L}} \quad . \quad (20)$$

Note that $|\delta\rangle$ in general depends on j although this is not explicitly indicated.

For the k -query algorithm to be successful, the states on the left-hand side of (18) must be orthogonal for $j \neq j'$. Suppose L is chosen such that $\frac{N}{L^k} \geq 2$. This implies that there exist two values of j , say j' and j'' for which the states

$$|\delta'\rangle + V_k\hat{F}_{j'}|\phi_k^\perp\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\delta''\rangle + V_k\hat{F}_{j''}|\phi_k^\perp\rangle \quad (21)$$

are orthogonal but

$$V_k\hat{F}_{j'}|\phi_k^\perp\rangle = V_k\hat{F}_{j''}|\phi_k^\perp\rangle \quad . \quad (22)$$

Taking the difference of the two states in (21) gives

$$\| |\delta'\rangle - |\delta''\rangle \| = \sqrt{2} \quad (23)$$

since the states in (21) have unit norm. However by (20) we see that (23) is impossible if

$$\frac{k}{\sqrt{L}} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (24)$$

Thus our k -query algorithm cannot succeed if there exists an L such that (24) is true and

$$\frac{N}{L^k} \geq 2 \quad . \quad (25)$$

This implies that, for large N , no k -query algorithm can succeed unless

$$2^{k+1}k^{2k} \geq N \quad . \quad (26)$$

For an algorithm that determines the correct point of insertion with probability $\epsilon > 0$ (ϵ independent of N), the states in (21) must have the absolute value of their inner product at most ϵ' where ϵ' depends on ϵ . This is impossible if $\frac{k}{\sqrt{L}} < \rho$, for some ρ depending on ϵ' . In this case, (26) becomes

$$2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\right)^{2k} k^{2k} \geq N \quad . \quad (27)$$

For large N , either (26) or (27) requires that condition (1) holds.

IV. REMARK

What is quantum mechanical about this proof? If the unitary operators were replaced by stochastic matrices, and $\|\cdot\|$ reinterpreted as the L_1 norm instead of the L_2 norm, then the $\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}$, in (8) and succeeding formulas, becomes $\frac{1}{L}$, and the bound ultimately becomes $\frac{\log_2 N}{\log_2 \log_2 N}$. Only the factor of 2 changes. Of course this is not the best classical lower bound, which is $\log_2 N$.

REFERENCES

- [1] L.K. Grover, "A Fast Quantum Mechanical Algorithm for Database Search," quant-ph/9605043.
- [2] C.H. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard and U.V. Vazirani, "Strengths and Weaknesses of Quantum Computing," quant-ph/9701001.
- [3] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, M. Sipser, "A Limit on the Speed of Quantum Computation in Determining Parity," quant-ph/9802045.
- [4] R. Beals, H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, M. Mosca, R. deWolf, "Quantum Lower Bounds by Polynomials," quant-ph/9802049.
- [5] H. Buhrman, R. deWolf, "Lower Bounds for Quantum Search and Derandomization," quant-ph/9811046.